

APPENDIX G

Alternatives Considered in Siting the
Proposed Central Health Services Center

APPENDIX G

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN SITING THE PROPOSED CENTRAL HEALTH SERVICES CENTER

In 2001, a federal class action law suit was settled (*Plata v. Schwarzenegger*) against the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) that addressed the quality of medical care in the State's 33-prison system. The U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California found that the California prison medical system violates the Eighth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, which forbids cruel and unusual punishment of the incarcerated.

In 2002, the State agreed to implement a variety of remedies that would bring prison medical care in line with constitutional standards. However, the court found that the State failed to comply with these requirements and in June 2005 issued an order to establish a federal Receivership. The California Prison Health Care Receivership Corp., (Receiver) is the organization responsible for administering the activities of the federal Receiver, Robert Sillen.

The purpose of the federal Receiver is to create a clinical environment at SQSP (and at other State prisons) that provides quality medical care to inmate patients in 17 areas of medical care delivery. The federal Receiver has been charged with overseeing the planning, design, and construction of a new medical building (a.k.a., Central Health Services Building [CHSC]) that will combine the functions of clinics, laboratory, X-Ray, pharmacy, medical records, primary, secondary, in-patient and urgent care under one roof to serve the inmate population at SQSP.

SQSP currently provides medical, mental health, and dental services to all inmates. Services are primarily provided in the Neumiller Building located at the southern tip of prison property. Limited services (e.g., small out-patient clinics) are available in small, temporary facilities located throughout the prison property. The federal court has determined that the existing Neumiller building can not adequately meet the medical needs of SQSP because of its inadequate size, dilapidated condition and lack of basic services and utilities. Further, in response to the 1990 Earthquake Safety and Public Rehabilitation Bond Act, a seismic evaluation determined that this building is classified as Seismic Risk Level V and would require substantial retrofit to meet current seismic safety standards.

The federal Receiver has directed that a new centralized health service center, Central Health Services Center (CHSC), shall be constructed at SQSP to meet court mandates for the provision of adequate medical services. Several potential alternative sites were considered in the site selection process for the CHSC. Unlike other types of construction projects, security and inmate movement is a primary concern when site planning and designing buildings for a prison. In siting a new medical facility on the existing grounds and within the existing prison multiple functional, operational, safety, and legal requirements must be considered and provided for in the ultimate site that is selected. The functional/operational, security/safety, and legal requirements that must be met are described below. In addition, CDCR must also evaluate the degree to which the alternatives under consideration would result in significant impacts on the environment.

FUNCTIONAL/OPERATIONAL REQUIREMENTS:

- CHSC must be easily accessible to the SQSP inmate population. Because the building would be used by inmates requiring various levels of medical attention (ambulatory clinical treatment to sub-acute in-patient), it must be located within the secure perimeter of the facility and within a short walking/escort distance (400–500 feet) from the main housing unit areas to allow for the safe, efficient escort for appointments and quick transport of inmates during medical crisis.
- Sufficient space must be provided for all medical services. Space requirements are determined based on population numbers and inmate security levels that would be served by the CHSC. Estimated space requirements are a minimum of approximately 115,000 square feet.
- The new location shall not permanently disrupt or otherwise alter other programs or functions within SQSP.
- SQSP must continue to provide existing levels of program services including receiving and release, prison industries, exercise yard space, and craft and hobby space.

SECURITY/SAFETY REQUIREMENTS:

- The new building location must maintain and provide for clean (i.e., unobstructed) sight lines of all building sides and out-of-bounds areas from existing perimeter towers.
- The new building location must allow SQSP to efficiently use existing security zones to maintain separation of facilities and complexes to accommodate security needs.
- The new building location must meet all existing state building, seismic, accessibility, and fire and life safety design standards.

ENVIRONMENTAL REQUIREMENTS:

The new location should minimize, to the greatest degree feasible, potential environmental impacts associated with construction and operation of the new facility.

Based on the requirements described above, 10 alternative site locations were evaluated to determine whether they could be a feasible location for the proposed CHSC. The attached Exhibit depicts the location of these alternative sites. The results of the evaluation are provided in the table below.

Proposed Project	Constraints/Benefits
Building 22 Location	<p><i>Functional/Operational:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient construction staging areas would be available. • Would be located in close proximity to main prison population. • Would be within secure perimeter of SQSP. • Location accommodates SQ receiving and release (R&R) program back to its original functional location (R&R was required to be displaced from Building 22 due to seismic condition of building.) • Location does not displace existing levels of SQSP program services. <p><i>Security/Safety:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location provides reasonable walking distances (i.e., less than 500 feet) for prison staff escorting inmates to/from CHSC. • Maintains sight lines from existing guard towers. <p><i>Legal:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Applicable. <p><i>Environmental:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would demolish historic buildings, however, mitigation for historic resources may be available.

Alternative Site(s)	Constraints/Benefits
Main Entry Courtyard	<p><i>Functional/Operational:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area too small for proposed building size with accommodation of necessary site circulation. • Would restrict and/or require relocation of main entry point for prison staff. • No construction staging space would be available in this location. • Would be located close to main prison population • Would be within secure perimeter of SQSP. • May potentially block vehicular access for emergency vehicles and transport. • May require the relocation of existing chapel facilities, which are required to be provided in a central easily accessible location. <p><i>Security/Safety:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May not be able to meet building code setback requirements for new and existing structures (e.g., Adjustment Center and new building each would require a 20-foot setback resulting in a 40-foot building-to-building separation). <p><i>Legal:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Applicable. <p><i>Environmental:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to reduced area available for building footprint, would require the construction of a taller building that may be visible at off-site areas • Could result in significant visual impacts.

Alternative Site(s)	Constraints/Benefits
West Block Yard Space	<p><u>Functional:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area too small for proposed building size upon compliance with building code setback requirements. • No construction staging space would be available in this location. • Would be located close to main prison population. • Would be within secure perimeter of SQSP. • Would block emergency vehicle access to housing blocks and support buildings. • Yard space at SQSP currently does not meet legal standards outlined in CDCR Space Standards Guidelines. Reduction of current space would further limit recreational space below acceptable levels. <p><u>Security/Safety:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site lines for monitoring inmate escort and movement could not be maintained. • May not be able to meet building code setback requirements. • Removal of yard space would reduce area available for fire refuge (i.e., evacuation of housing unit in the event of a fire) and emergency staging. <p><u>Legal:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Applicable. <p><u>Environmental:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would not be feasible from a design and siting standpoint.
Neumiller Building	<p><u>Functional/Operational:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing building does not provide enough space and is not adequate to meet constitutional requirements for health care delivery. • Demolition of building and construction of new building would require the provision of temporary space (“swing space”) for health care services. No space is available within secure perimeter of SQSP. • Construction staging space would be available. • Would be located close to main prison population. • Would be within secure perimeter of SQSP. <p><u>Security/Safety:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing building is seismically unsafe and would require upgrade, renovation, expansion and retrofit (evaluated in response to SB 1250 by the Division of the State Architect in consultation with the Seismic Safety Commission). Seismic risk level V. <p><u>Legal:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing legal challenges for inadequacies with health care at SQSP are based on the inadequate facilities provided in the Neumiller Building. <p><u>Environmental:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of a new multi-story building in this location would be highly visible from off-site areas and could result in significant visual impacts. • This building is a significant historic resources and demolition could result in a significant impact.

Alternative Site(s)	Constraints/Benefits
General Population Yard Space	<p><u>Functional/Operational:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction staging space would be available. • Would be located close to main prison population. • Would be within secure perimeter of SQSP. • Building would obstruct sight lines. • Yard space at SQSP currently does not meet operational standards outlined in CDCR Space Standards Guidelines. Reduction of current space would further limit recreational space below acceptable levels. <p><u>Security/Safety:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of yard space would reduce primary area available for fire refuge (i.e., evacuation of housing unit in the event of a fire) and emergency staging <p><u>Legal:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Applicable. <p><u>Environmental:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would not require demolition of any structures
Existing Building 22	<p><u>Functional/Operational:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would be located close to main prison population • Would be within secure perimeter of SQSP. • Usable functional area of existing building at 37,200 net square feet is far short of the 100,000 square feet program space requirement. Program reduction would adversely affect ability to meet health care delivery objectives of the project. • Would not provide sufficient net building area to allow existing SQSP program to be reinstalled into this original location (R&R, Library, etc. originally resided in this building prior to required vacation). <p><u>Security/Safety:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing building is seismically unsafe and would require retrofit (evaluated in response to SB 1250 by the Division of the State Architect in consultation with the Seismic Safety Commission). Seismic risk level VI. • Seismic retrofit is not economically feasible. Bid proposals substantially exceed budget authorized by the State Legislature. See Note A below. <p><u>Legal:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would not provide sufficient net building area to allow existing SQSP program to be reinstalled into this original location (R&R, Library, etc. originally resided in this building prior to required vacation). <p><u>Environmental:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would stabilize and retain a historic building.

Alternative Site(s)	Constraints/Benefits
West Yard/Laundry Area	<p><u>Functional/Operational:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located a significant distance (i.e., greater than 500 feet) from main prison population. (Distance approximated at +800 ft). • Would be within secure perimeter of SQSP. • Construction staging would be available. • Could result in potential conflicts with primary vehicle circulation into the secure perimeter of SQSP (i.e., immediately adjacent the vehicle sallyport and entry point). <p><u>Security/Safety:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would increase safety hazards to guards escorting inmates over long distance and during inclement weather (e.g., fog). May preclude access of inmates to medical care. <p><u>Legal:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Applicable. <p><u>Environmental:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would require demolition of some structures, some of which may be historically significant.
Warehouse Area #1	<p><u>Functional/Operational:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outside secure perimeter • Located a significant distance (i.e., greater than 500 feet) from main prison population. (Distance approximated at +1,000 ft) • Heightened security risk and procedures for escort and transport of inmates in and out of secured limits of prison. <p><u>Security/Safety:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would increase safety hazards to guards escorting inmates over long distance and during inclement weather (e.g., fog). May preclude access of inmates to medical care. <p><u>Legal:</u> Not applicable.</p> <p><u>Environmental:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would require demolition of some structure, some of which have been identified as historically significant.
Warehouse Area #2	<p><u>Functional/Operational:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outside secure perimeter. • Located a significant distance (i.e., greater than 500 feet) from main prison population. (approximated at +1,500 ft). • Heightened security risk and procedures for escort and transport of inmates in and out of secured limits of prison. <p><u>Security/Safety:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would increase safety hazards to guards escorting inmates over long distanced and during inclement weather (e.g., fog). May preclude access of inmates to medical care. <p><u>Legal:</u> Not applicable</p> <p><u>Environmental:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would require demolition of some structures.

Alternative Site(s)	Constraints/Benefits
Prison Industry Buildings	<p><u>Functional/Operational:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outside secure perimeter • Located a significant distance (i.e., greater than 500 feet) from main prison population. (approximated at +800 ft). • Heightened security risk and procedures for escort and transport of inmates in and out of secured limits of prison. • This space currently supports the prison industry operations (furniture manufacturing). This program would need to be relocated within SQSP. No space is available for relocation while still meeting other program requirements at SQSP. <p><u>Security/Safety:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would increase safety hazards to guards escorting inmates over long distance and during inclement weather (e.g., fog). May preclude access of inmates to medical care. <p><u>Legal:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not Applicable. <p><u>Environmental:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial demolition would be required • Potential hazardous materials could be present from manufacturing activities.
H-Unit/Approved Condemned Inmate Complex	<p><u>Functional/Operational:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This area is currently proposed for the proposed Condemned Inmate Complex (approved in 2005). Construction would begin in Fall 2007. • Outside secure perimeter. • Located a significant distance (i.e., greater than 500 feet) from main prison population. (approximated at +2,000 ft). • Heightened security risk and procedures for escort and transport of inmates in and out of secured limits of prison. <p><u>Security/Safety:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would increase safety hazards to guards escorting inmates over long distance and during inclement weather (e.g. fog). May preclude access of inmates to medical care. <p><u>Legal:</u> Not applicable</p> <p><u>Environmental:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is located on bay mud and would require more intensive construction techniques (e.g., pile driving) to provide adequate building foundations. • Would have a more significant impact on biological resources. • Would avoid significant historic resources impacts

Based on review of this evaluation, the existing Building 22 was determined to be the only feasible location that would meet the functional, operational, safety, and legal requirements described above and that could be implemented in a timely manner based on the direction given by the Federal Receiver.

NOTE A

The existing Building #22 was evaluated in response to SB 1250 by the Division of the State Architect (DSA) in consultation with the Seismic Safety Commission (SSC) to determine its susceptibility to earthquakes. Building #22 was one of the 14,000 State owned buildings that were identified within the most significant buildings in terms of population at risk and type of use for evaluation.

DSA established a 5-step evaluation process in order to fulfill its mandate under SB 1250. As part of this process the “Top 50” buildings were identified to receive Structural Retrofit Only. Out of seven risk levels (seven having the highest risk for risk to life, systems and occupancy), Building #22 was included in the designated “Top 50” with a Seismic Risk level of VI. The following describes the characteristics of a Level VI seismic risk as it relates to Building #22.

<u>Risk Level</u>	<u>Aspect</u>	<u>Anticipated Result</u>
VI	Building:	Extensive structural damage, collapse likely; repair probably not cost effective.
	Risk to Life:	Imminent threat to occupants and/or adjacent property.
	Systems:	Total disruption of systems; repair probably not cost effective.
	Occupancy:	Should be vacated until structural upgrading is accomplished.

As a result of the findings of the evaluation, Building #22 was vacated and the seismic retrofit of building was designed and bid. The authorized budget for the seismic retrofit was established at approximately \$13 million and the bids were received at approximately \$20 million with a cost close to \$530 per square foot for the seismic retrofit alone. This project did not include the additional costs necessary to upgrade the Building #22 for Fire Life Safety, accessibility and program related improvements that would be required to support the ultimate use of the building by San Quentin.

The bids received together with the additional costs for building improvements validated the evaluation result that the repair to the extensive structural condition is not cost effective strongly suggesting that demolition and replacement of the building is the most realistic result to replace the building floor area back into use by San Quentin and by such allowing consideration of this location for the new CHSC.

The location of Building #22 is ideal due to its proximity to the housing blocks for access by inmates as well as vehicular access for emergency transport of inmate patients out of the institution for more extensive health care services and treatments not available at the institution.



SQSP CHSC—On-Site Locations Considered in Siting the CHSC

Exhibit 7-1